UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/749,473	12/31/2003	Kavin Du	121532	3931

26389   7590   11/13/2008
CHRISTENSEN, O'CONNOR, JOHNSON, KINDNESS, PLLC
1420 FIFTH AVENUE
SUITE 2800
SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347

EXAMINER
SERRAO, RANODHI N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2441	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/13/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 August 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-10 and 12-38* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-10 and 12-38* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments filed 26 August 2008 have been fully considered but they

are not persuasive.

2.   Applicant argued,

> *Similarly, neither Bernard nor Kinjo (nor Siegel for that matter) discloses a
> method that includes "for each of the multiple instances of identifying data,
> extracting the identifying data from the image using a data recognition procedure
> that produces an output" and "comparing the output of each of the data
> recognition procedures to corroborate the identification of the selected item that
> is obtained from each instance of the identifying data."*

3.   The examiner respectfully disagrees. Kinjo in ¶ 34 states, "In this aspect, the

order identifying means can identify the photographed image based on the

identification code extracted from the received photographed image." And in ¶ 36,

states, "The order identifying means has a special characteristic in that **it can extract**

the attached second identification image from the image represented by the image

data that the order receiving means received, and identify the article as a photographed

object in an image based on the second identification image." Thus Kinjo clearly

teaches the limitation: *for each of the multiple instances of identifying data, extracting*

the identifying data from the image using a data recognition procedure that produces an

output. Furthermore, in ¶ 135, Kinjo states, "When customers order a specific article that

is exhibited in the store, the article and the identification plate near said article **must be**

included in the photograph that the customer takes. The order processing apparatus

12 extracts the identification plate from the photographic image data that it receives and

based upon the extracted portion with the identification plate, **it is able to verify** the

photographed article as the displayed article." Therefore, Kinjo also teaches: *comparing*

the output of each of the data recognition procedures to corroborate the identification of

the selected item that is obtained from each instance of the identifying data.

4.   Applicant furthermore stated,

> *For reasons similar to those previously discussed with respect to Claim 1, neither*
> *Bernard nor Kinjo discloses directly communicating the image containing multiple*
> *instances of the identifying data to a server operated by the second retail entity,*
> *wherein the selected item is available for purchase from the second retail entity,*
> *nor do they disclose receiving item information for multiple items that result from*
> *conflicting identifying data that is obtained from the image.*

5.   The examiner submits that Bernard in col. 55, lines 36-43 states, "The portable

bar-code scanner provides the product code to in-store system 3908. In-store system

3908 **communicates this information to the automated product purchasing**

system to request sampling for that product." Thus, Bernard teaches: *directly*

communicating the identifying data to a server operated by the second retail entity,

wherein the selected item is available for purchase from the second retail entity. And

Kinjo in ¶ 115 states, "In step 204, the data of the area corresponding to the

identification code is extracted from the photographic **image data received from the**

customer." Hence Kinjo teaches: *directly communicating the image containing multiple*

instances of the identifying data to a server. And therefore, the combination of Bernard

and Kinjo teaches the claimed limitations.

6.   In conclusion, upon taking the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims,

the cited references teach all of the claimed limitations. And the rejections are

maintained. See below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can

be found in a prior Office action.

8.   **Claim 1, 12, 22, 30, and 36-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being**

unpatentable over Bernard et al. (5,918,213) and Kinjo (2003/0063575).

9.   As per claim 1, Bernard et al. teaches a method for communicating information

regarding a selected item to a user present at a location of a first retail entity from a

second retail entity different from the first retail entity (see Bernard et al., col. 53, lines

34-42), wherein the selected item is available for purchase at the second retail entity

(see Bernard et al., col. 53, lines 27-33), the method comprising: while the user remains

present at the location of the first retail entity, the second retail entity: receiving a bar

code directly from a bar-code scanner of the user, wherein the bar-code contains

identifying data associated with the selected item (see Bernard et al., col. 53, line 65-

col. 54, line 6 and col. 54, lines 28-50); using the identifying data to obtain item

information associated with the selected item (see Bernard et al., col. 54, lines 28-50);

and communicating the item information directly from the second retail entity to the

scanning device of the user (see Bernard et al., col. 54, lines 28-50). But fails to teach

receiving an image from the user using an imaging device, wherein the image contains

multiple instances identifying data associated with the selected item; for each of the

multiple instances of identifying data, extracting the identifying data from the image

using a data recognition procedure that produces an output; comparing the output of

each of the data recognition procedures to corroborate the identification of the selected

item that is obtained from each instance of the identifying data; using the corroborated

identifying data to obtain item information associated with the selected item. However,

Kinjo teaches receiving an image from the user using an imaging device, wherein the

image contains multiple instances of identifying data associated with the selected item

(see Kinjo, ¶ 124 and ¶ 134); for each of the multiple instances of identifying data,

extracting the identifying data from the image using a data recognition procedure that

produces an output (see Kinjo, ¶ 34-37); comparing the output of each of the data

recognition procedures to corroborate the identification of the selected item that is

obtained from each instance of the identifying data (see Kinjo, ¶ 135); using the

corroborated identifying data to obtain item information associated with the selected

item (see Kinjo, ¶ 141-143). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in

the art at the time of the invention to modify Bernard et al. to receiving an image from

the user using an imaging device, wherein the image contains multiple instances

identifying data associated with the selected item; for each of the multiple instances of

identifying data, extracting the identifying data from the image using a data recognition

procedure that produces an output; comparing the output of each of the data recognition

procedures to corroborate the identification of the selected item that is obtained from

each instance of the identifying data; using the corroborated identifying data to obtain

item information associated with the selected item in order to provide an order

processing apparatus and an image photographing device with which a customer can

easily place an order corresponding to images displayed on a display medium (see

Kinjo, ¶ 8).

10.   As per claim 12, Bernard et al. teaches a system for communicating information

regarding a selected item to a user present at a location of a first retail entity (see

Bernard et al., col. 53, lines 34-42), wherein the system comprises a server operated by

a second retail entity that is different than the first retail entity (see Bernard et al., col.

20, lines 48-64) and the selected item is available for purchase at the second retail

entity (see Bernard et al., col. 53, lines 27-33), the server comprising: a subsystem

configured to receive a bar-code directly from a scanning device of the user, wherein

the bar-code contains identifying data associated with the selected item (see Bernard et

al., col. 53, line 65-col. 54, line 6 and col. 54, lines 28-50); a subsystem configured to

use the identifying data to obtain item information associated with the selected item (see

Bernard et al., col. 54, lines 28-50), wherein the item information is obtained from at

least one resource (see Bernard et al., col. 53, lines 53-64); and a subsystem

configured to communicate the item information directly to the scanning device of the

user while the user remains present at the location of the first retail entity (see Bernard

et al., col. 54, lines 28-50). But fails to teach a server being in communication with an

imaging device of the user that is configured to capture an image of identifying data

associated with the selected item; wherein the image contains multiple instances of

identifying data associated with the selected item; a subsystem configured to extract the

identifying data from each of the multiple instances in the image using a data

recognition procedure that operates on an instance of the identifying data and produces

an output; a subsystem configured to compare the output of each of the data

recognition procedures to corroborate the identification of the selected item that is

obtained from each instance of the identifying data; a subsystem configured to use the

corroborated identifying data to obtain item information associated with the selected

item. However, Kinjo teaches a server being in communication with an imaging device

of the user that is configured to capture an image of identifying data associated with the

selected item (see Kinjo, ¶ 132-134); wherein the image contains multiple instances of

identifying data associated with the selected item (see Kinjo, ¶ 124); a subsystem

configured to extract the identifying data from each of the multiple instances in the

image using a data recognition procedure that operates on an instance of the identifying

data and produces an output (see Kinjo, ¶ 34-37); a subsystem configured to compare

the output of each of the data recognition procedures to corroborate the identification of

the selected item that is obtained from each instance of the identifying data (see Kinjo, ¶

135); a subsystem configured to use the corroborated identifying data to obtain item

information associated with the selected item (see Kinjo, ¶ 141-143). It would have been

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify

Bernard et al. to a server being in communication with an imaging device of the user

that is configured to capture an image of identifying data associated with the selected

item; wherein the image contains multiple instances of identifying data associated with

the selected item; a subsystem configured to extract the identifying data from each of

the multiple instances in the image using a data recognition procedure that operates on

an instance of the identifying data and produces an output; a subsystem configured to

compare the output of each of the data recognition procedures to corroborate the

identification of the selected item that is obtained from each instance of the identifying

data; a subsystem configured to use the corroborated identifying data to obtain item

information associated with the selected item in order to provide an order processing

apparatus and an image photographing device with which a customer can easily place

an order corresponding to images displayed on a display medium (see Kinjo, ¶ 8).

11.   As per claim 22, Bernard et al. teaches a computer-readable storage medium

having a computer-executable component for communicating item information for a

selected item to a user present at a location of a first retail entity (see Bernard et al., col.

53, lines 34-42), wherein the selected item is available for purchase at a second retail

entity that is different than the first retail entity (see Bernard et al., col. 53, lines 27-33),

and wherein the computer-executable component is executed by a server of the second

retail entity (see Bernard et al., col. 20, lines 48-64) and communicates the item

information by: receiving a bar-code directly from an scanning device of the user, said

bar-code containing identifying data associated with the selected item (see Bernard et

al., col. 53, line 65-col. 54, line 6 and col. 54, lines 28-50); using the identifying data to

obtain item information associated with the selected item (see Bernard et al., col. 54,

lines 28-50); and communicating the item information directly from the server to the

scanning device of the user while the user remains present at the location of the first

retail entity (see Bernard et al., col. 54, lines 28-50). But fails to teach receiving an

image from an imaging device of the user; said image containing multiple instances of

identifying data associated with the selected item; for each of the multiple instances of

identifying data, extracting the identifying data from the image using a data recognition

procedure that produces an output; comparing the output of each of the data recognition

procedures to corroborate the identification of the selected item that is obtained from

each instance of the identifying data; using the corroborated identifying data to obtain

item information associated with the selected item. However, Kinjo teaches receiving an

image from an imaging device of the user (see Kinjo, ¶ 132-134); said image containing

multiple instances of identifying data associated with the selected item (see Kinjo, ¶

124); for each of the multiple instances of identifying data, extracting the identifying data

from the image using a data recognition procedure that produces an output (see Kinjo, ¶

34-37); comparing the output of each of the data recognition procedures to corroborate

the identification of the selected item that is obtained from each instance of the

identifying data (see Kinjo, ¶ 135); using the corroborated identifying data to obtain item

information associated with the selected item (see Kinjo, ¶ 141-143). It would have been

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify

Bernard et al. to receiving an image from an imaging device of the user; said image

containing multiple instances of identifying data associated with the selected item; for

each of the multiple instances of identifying data, extracting the identifying data from the

image using a data recognition procedure that produces an output; comparing the

output of each of the data recognition procedures to corroborate the identification of the

selected item that is obtained from each instance of the identifying data; using the

corroborated identifying data to obtain item information associated with the selected

item in order to provide an order processing apparatus and an image photographing

device with which a customer can easily place an order corresponding to images

displayed on a display medium (see Kinjo, ¶ 8).

12.   As per claim 30, Bernard et al. teaches an integrated portable apparatus for

obtaining item information for a selected item available for purchase at a location of a

first retail entity (see Bernard et al., col. 53, lines 34-42), the apparatus comprising: an

input device configured to capture an bar-code that contains identifying data associated

with the selected item (see Bernard et al., col. 53, line 65-col. 54, line 6 and col. 54,

lines 28-50); an output device for outputting item information for the selected item as

obtained from a second retail entity that is different than the first retail entity; a storage

medium for storing said identifying data and program instructions for processing the bar-

code (see Bernard et al., col. 53, lines 27-33); and a processing unit communicatively

coupled to the input device, the output device, and the storage medium, for executing

the program instructions that process the bar-code by: communicating the bar-code

containing the identifying data directly to a server operated by the second retail entity

(see Bernard et al., col. 20, lines 48-64), wherein the selected item is available for

purchase from the second retail entity (see Bernard et al., col. 53, lines 27-33);

receiving, directly from the server of the second retail entity, item information for multiple

items (see Bernard et al., col. 59, lines 18-52); and outputting on the output device the

item information for multiple items, wherein the output device communicates the item

information to a user while the user remains at the location of the first retail entity (see

Bernard et al., col. 54, lines 28-50). But fails to teach an input device configured to

capture an image that contains multiple instances of identifying data associated with the

selected item; a storage medium for storing said identifying data and program

instructions for processing the image; and a processing unit communicatively coupled to

the input device, the output device, and the storage medium, for executing the program

instructions that process the image by: communicating the image containing the multiple

instances of identifying data; receiving, directly from the server, item information for

multiple items that result from conflicting identifying data obtained from the image.

However, Kinjo teaches an input device configured to capture an image that contains

multiple instances of identifying data associated with the selected item (see Kinjo, ¶ 124

and ¶ 132-134); a storage medium for storing said identifying data and program

instructions for processing the image; and a processing unit communicatively coupled to

the input device, the output device, and the storage medium, for executing the program

instructions that process the image by: communicating the image containing the multiple

instances of identifying data (see Kinjo, ¶ 135-137); receiving, directly from the server,

item information for multiple items that result from conflicting identifying data obtained

from the image (see Kinjo, ¶ 125). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bernard et al. to an input device

configured to capture an image that contains multiple instances of identifying data

associated with the selected item; a storage medium for storing said identifying data

and program instructions for processing the image; and a processing unit

communicatively coupled to the input device, the output device, and the storage

medium, for executing the program instructions that process the image by:

communicating the image containing the multiple instances of identifying data;

receiving, directly from the server, item information for multiple items that result from

conflicting identifying data obtained from the image in order to provide an order

processing apparatus and an image photographing device with which a customer can

easily place an order corresponding to images displayed on a display medium (see

Kinjo, ¶ 8).

13.   As per claims 36-38, the above-mentioned motivation of claim 1 applies fully in

order to combine Bernard et al. and Kinjo.

14.   As per claim 36, Bernard in view of Kinjo teach a method, further comprising

judging a quality of the output of each of the data recognition procedures and using the

best identifying data to obtain the item information (see Kinjo, ¶ 125).

15.   As per claim 37, Bernard in view of Kinjo teach a method, further comprising

polling the user to determine the correct identifying data for the selected item if the

output of the data recognition procedures results in conflicting identifying data (see

Kinjo, ¶ 127).

16.   As per claim 38, Bernard in view of Kinjo teach a method, wherein if the data

recognition procedures output conflicting identifying data, the method further comprises

obtaining item information for all of the items identified by the output of the data

recognition procedures (see Kinjo, ¶ 124).

17.   Claims 2, 4-10, 13, 14, 29, and 31-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bernard et al. and Kinjo as applied to claims 1, 12, 22, and 30 above, and further in view of Siegel et al. (2002/0082931).

18.   As per claim 2, Bernard et al. and Kinjo teach the mentioned limitations of claim 1 above but fail to teach a method, further comprising formatting the item information for output on a visual display of the imaging device when the item information is communicated from the second retail entity to the imaging device. However, Siegel et al. teaches a method, further comprising formatting the item information for output on a visual display of the imaging device when the item information is communicated from the second retail entity to the imaging device (see Siegel et al., ¶ 70). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bernard et al. and Kinjo to a method, further comprising formatting the item information for output on a visual display of the imaging device when the item information is communicated from the second retail entity to the imaging device in order to enable users to obtain information regarding a retailable or consumer product on the basis of encoded information, for example, on the product itself or its associated packaging or advertisements (see Siegel et al., ¶ 1).

19.   As per claims 4-10, 13, 14, 29, and 31-35, the above-mentioned motivation of claim 2 applies fully in order to combine Bernard et al., Kinjo and Siegel et al.

20.   As per claim 4, Bernard et al., Siegel et al., and Kinjo teach a method, wherein the imaging device is a digital camera capable of communicating the image containing the identifying data (see Siegel et al., ¶ 34).

21.   As per claim 5, Bernard et al., Siegel et al., and Kinjo teach a method, wherein

the imaging device is a mobile telephone having a component for capturing an image

containing the identifying data (see Siegel et al., ¶ 37).

22.   As per claim 6, Bernard et al., Siegel et al., and Kinjo teach a method, wherein

the imaging device is a portable computing device having a component for capturing an

image containing the identifying data (see Siegel et al., ¶ 37).

23.   As per claim 7, Bernard et al., Siegel et al., and Kinjo teach a method, wherein

the method further comprises: compiling historical data based on a number of times an

image has been received from different imaging devices, said image containing

identifying data associated with the selected item; using the historical data to estimate

consumer demand for the selected item; and generating a report that forecasts future

purchasing activity for the selected item based on the estimated consumer demand (see

Siegel et al., ¶ 64).

24.   As per claim 8, Bernard et al., Siegel et al., and Kinjo teach a method, wherein

the item information comprises rating information for the selected item associated with

the identifying data (see Siegel et al., ¶ 57).

25.   As per claim 9, Bernard et al., Siegel et al., and Kinjo teach a method, wherein

the item information comprises price information for the selected item associated with

the identifying data (see Siegel et al., ¶ 57).

26.   As per claim 10, Bernard et al., Siegel et al., and Kinjo teach a method, wherein

at least one instance of the identifying data comprises a universal product code and

another instance of the identifying data comprises text (see Siegel et al., ¶ 45-46).

27.   As per claim 13, Bernard et al., Siegel et al., and Kinjo teach a system, wherein

the resource is a Web service providing information related to the selected item (see

Siegel et al., ¶ 48).

28.   As per claim 14, Bernard et al., Siegel et al., and Kinjo teach a system, wherein

the resource is a database storing information related to the selected item (see Siegel et

al., ¶ 48).

29.   As per claim 29, Bernard et al., Siegel et al., and Kinjo teach a computer-

readable storage medium, wherein extracting identifying data associated with the

selected item from the universal product code with a UPC recognition program to

produce a first output and processing the text with an optical character recognition

program to produce a second output (see Siegel et al., ¶ 67).

30.   As per claim 31, Bernard et al., Siegel et al., and Kinjo teach an apparatus,

wherein the processing unit further executes program instructions that process the

image by extracting the multiple instances of identifying data from the image using a

data recognition procedure that produces an output (see Siegel et al., ¶ 48).

31.   As per claim 32, Bernard et al., Siegel et al., and Kinjo teach an apparatus,

wherein at least on instance of the identifying data is barcode data and the processing

unit extracts the barcode data by executing a barcode recognition program that

operates on the image (see Siegel et al., ¶ 28).

32.   As per claim 33, Bernard et al., Siegel et al., and Kinjo teach an apparatus,

wherein at least one instance of the identifying data is text data and the processing unit

extracts the text data by executing an optical character recognition program that

operates on the image (see Kinjo, ¶ 124).

33.   As per claim 34, Bernard et al., Siegel et al., and Kinjo teach an apparatus,

wherein the processing unit communicates the image to the server operated by the

second retail entity at a location remote from the first retail entity, for the server to

extract the identifying data from the image (see Siegel et al., ¶ 54-55).

34.   As per claim 35, Bernard et al., Siegel et al., and Kinjo teach an apparatus,

wherein the item information for the selected item is obtained by retrieving item

information from a database maintained on behalf of the second retail entity, wherein

the item information corresponds to the identifying data for the selected item (see Siegel

et al., ¶ 56-59).

35.   **Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over**

Bernard et al. and Kinjo as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of

Fitzsimmons, JR. (2002/0068991). Bernard et al. and Kinjo teach the mentioned

limitations of claim 3 above and Kinjo furthermore teaches an imaging device (see

Kinjo, ¶ 132-134) and Bernard et al. furthermore teaches item information

communicated from the second retail entity to a scanning device (see Bernard et al.,

col. 54, lines 28-50). But fail to teach a method, further comprising formatting the item

information for output on an audio speaker of the imaging device. However,

Fitzsimmons, JR. teaches a method, further comprising outputting the item information

on an audio speaker of the imaging device (see Fitzsimmons, JR., ¶ 6). It would have

been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify

Bernard et al. and Kinjo to a method, further comprising formatting the item information

for output on an audio speaker of the imaging device in order to improve methods and

apparatus for enriching the experience of a visitor to a display facility or other public

space (see Fitzsimmons, JR. ¶ 5).

36.   Claims 15-21 and 23-28 have similar limitations as to claims 1-10, 12-14, 22, and

29-35 therefore, they are being rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ranodhi Serrao whose telephone number is (571)272-7967. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30pm, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (571)272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/R. N. S./

Examiner, Art Unit 2441

10/31/2008

/William C. Vaughn, Jr./
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2444